

REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration and substantive effort given to this case. Claims 1, 4, 12 and 15 have been amended. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

The Examiner has objected to Figure 1. Paragraphs [0012] and [0019] have been amended to conform to Figure 1. No new matter has been added based on these amendments. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to Figure 1.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants believe that the rejection properly refers to claims 4 and 15 based on the claim language discussed by the Examiner. Accordingly, claims 4 and 15 have been amended to satisfy the Examiner's objection. If Applicants have misinterpreted the Examiner's rejection, Applicants respectfully request a telephone interview with the Examiner in lieu of a final office action.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9 and 12-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0156812 to *Krasnoiarov et al.* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0109197 to *Gardaz et al.* Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection based on the following remarks.

Independent claims 1 and 12 incorporate numerous features not disclosed in the prior art cited by the Examiner. For example, neither *Krasnoiarov et al.* nor *Gardaz et al.*, whether considered alone or in combination, discloses "compiling the converted deliverables for distribution over a plurality of delivery channels," as required by amended independent claims 1 and 12.